

REMARKS

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 5-12 and 25-29 are now present in this application. Claim 1 is independent.

Amendments have been made to claim 1, claims 2-4 and 13-24 have been canceled, and claims 25-29 have been added. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed July 1, 2005 and August 11, 2005, and for providing Applicants with initialed copies of the PTO-SB08 forms filed therewith.

Drawings

Since no objection has been received, Applicants assume that the drawings are acceptable and that no further action is necessary. Confirmation thereof in the next Office Action is respectfully requested.

Restriction Requirement

The Examiner has made the Restriction Requirement final, and has withdrawn claims 13-24 from further consideration. By this Amendment, Applicants have canceled non-elected claims 13-24. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application directed to claims 13-24 at a later date if so desired.

Election of Species Requirement

It appears that the Examiner has withdrawn the election of species requirement, because the Examiner has acted on all of claims 1-12 that were subject to the previous requirement.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 5-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that claim 5 is a duplicate of claim 3, and that claim 9 is a duplicate of claim 4.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have canceled claims 3 and 4 to delete the duplicate claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a/e) as being anticipated by Yokota. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

At the outset, Applicants have canceled claims 3 and 4, rendering this part of the rejection moot.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6 and 8-11, while not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2 which was not included in this rejection, thereby automatically overcoming this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a/e). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yokota. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a motor including a stator, a rotor rotatably disposed around the stator, and a rotor cup having cooling-holes formed at the bottom part thereof for allowing external air to flow into the inside of the rotor cup therethrough, and lower blades formed at the bottom part thereof for generating a blowing force, the rotor being fixed to the rotor cup at the inner circumference thereof, "wherein each of the lower blades is protruded from one side of each of the cooling-holes towards the stator, and wherein each of the lower blades and the cooling-holes has an acute sloping angle to the line extended in the rotating direction of the rotor cup and perpendicular to the radial direction of the rotor cup." Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Yokota.

The Examiner states that Yokota shows semicircular cooling holes 19 and angled lower blades 16,26.

Applicants respectfully submit that the blades 26 of Yokota are spaced away from the semicircular cooling holes 19. Accordingly, Yokota fails to disclose that "each of the lower blades is protruded from one side of each of the cooling-holes towards the stator," as recited in amended claim 1. For at least this reason, Yokota does not anticipate claim 1.

In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the cooling holes 19 of Yokota are semicircular. Accordingly, Yokota fails to disclose that each of "the cooling-holes has an acute sloping angle to the line extended in the rotating direction of the rotor cup and perpendicular to the radial direction of the rotor cup," as set forth in amended claim 1. For at least this additional reason, Yokota does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Yokota, for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 7 and 12, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 12 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 7 and 12 are allowable based on their dependence from claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 25-29

Claims 25-29 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants submit that claims 25-29 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In addition, claims 25-29 recite further limitations which are not disclosed or made obvious by the applied prior art references.

Consideration and allowance of claims 25-29 are respectfully requested.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone James T. Eller, Jr., Registration No. 39,538, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By


James T. Eller, Jr.

Registration No.: 39,538

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant